UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

m ꓴ

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/660,899	09/12/2003	Matthew Ruhlen	MS301841.1/60001.260US01	6970

7590   07/18/2007

William J. Daley
Merchant & Gould P.C.
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903

EXAMINER
PHAM, HUNG Q

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2168	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
07/18/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary		10/660,899	RUHLEN, MATTHEW
		Examiner	**Art Unit**	
		HUNG Q. PHAM	2168	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>27 April 2007</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1,3-15,17-29 and 31-42</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1,3,4,9-15,17,18,23-29,31,32,37-42</u> is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) <u>5-8,19-22 and 33-36</u> is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in

37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible

for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has

been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37

CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 04/27/07 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

The rejection of claims 30-42 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 has been withdrawn in view of the

amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

Applicant's arguments with respect to the rejection of claims 1-7, 9, 12, 15-21, 23, 26,

29-35, 37 and 40 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of
making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the
art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall
set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1, 15 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to

comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter

which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to

one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed,

had possession of the claimed invention.

As in claims 1, 15 and 29, the claimed limitation, *interpreting a format specifier associated with the patterned URL*, was not described in the Specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claim 1,

the clause, *the destination URL* at line 18, references to at two destination URLs at lines 1-13. It is unclear what destination URL is being referenced;

the clause, *the copied character* at line 16, references to other items in the claim. It is unclear what item is being referenced.

Claims 3 and 17 recite the limitation *the service*. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by
another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent
granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the
applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section
351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States
only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2)
of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 15, 17, 18, 23-29, 31, 32 and 37-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as

being anticipated by Cohen et al. [USP 6,654,741 B1].

Regarding claims 15 and 29, Cohen teaches a system and program for redirecting a

request URL comprising:

a processor (Col. 3 Lines 10-16);

a memory coupled with and readable by the processor and having stored therein

instructions which, when executed by the processor, cause the processor to (Col. 3 Lines 14-16 and Col. 4

Lines 25-39)

   receive a request Uniform Resource Locator (URL) (Col. 6 Lines 11-12);

   determine a patterned URL based on the request URL (Col. 6 Lines 12-18, Input

Expression as *patterned URL*));

   identify a character from the patterned URL that indicates a pattern that indicates a data source

type, wherein the data source type identifies a location of data for generating a destination URL (As

shown in Cohen, FIG. 3, the character [ ] as *a data source type*, the [ ] indicates a location of

data for generating a destination URL, e.g., b[aeiou]d matches bad, bed, bid, bod and

bud but not bead or beed);

> *interpret a format specifier associated with the patterned URL* (the + sign of FIG. 3 as *a*
>
> *format specifier* is determined), *wherein the format specifier indicates conditional formatting for the*
>
> *destination URL* (Col. 6 Lines 21-25, the output URL is generated based on the Output
>
> Expression based on the regular expression of Input Expression); and
>
> *generate the destination URL having data from the location indicated by the data source type*
>
> *wherein the data is formatted based on the format specifier of the patterned*
>
> *URL* (Col. 6 Lines 21-25, the output URL is generated based on the Output Expression

based on the regular expression of Input Expression).

Regarding claims 17 and 31, Cohen teaches all of the claimed subject matter as

discussed above with respect to claims 15 and 29, Cohen further discloses the step of *looking up*

an Hyper-Text Transfer Protocol (HTTP) address for the service and placing the address into the destination

URL when the format specifier indicates the name of the service (Cohen, Col. 6 Lines 10-43).

Regarding claims 18 and 32, Cohen teaches all of the claimed subject matter as

discussed above with respect to claims 15 and 29, Cohen further discloses the step of *copying*

string data into the destination URL when the format specifier indicates the string data (Cohen, Col. 6 Lines

10-43).

Regarding claims 23 and 37, Cohen teaches all of the claimed subject matter as

discussed above with respect to claims 15 and 29, Cohen further discloses the step of *copying a*

following string to the destination URL when a previous portion of the patterned URL caused data to be written

to the destination URL and when the format specifier indicates a special string copy (Cohen, Col. 5 Lines 40-67).

Regarding claims 24 and 38, Cohen teaches all of the claimed subject matter as discussed above with respect to claims 15 and 29, Cohen further discloses the step of *copying a path part from the request URL to the destination URL, when the data source type indicates that data is located in a path portion of the request URL* (Cohen, Col. 5 Lines 40-67).

Regarding claims 25 and 39, Cohen teaches all of the claimed subject matter as discussed above with respect to claims 15 and 29, Cohen further discloses the step of *copying data from a query string of the request URL to the destination URL when the data source type indicates that data is located in the query string of the request URL* (Cohen, Col. 5 Lines 40-67).

Regarding claims 26 and 40, Cohen teaches all of the claimed subject matter as discussed above with respect to claims 15 and 29, Cohen further discloses the step of *copying a data source identifier from the patterned URL to the destination URL when the data source indicates that data is located in the data source identifier of the patterned URL* (Cohen, Col. 5 Lines 40-67).

Regarding claims 27 and 41, Cohen teaches all of the claimed subject matter as discussed above with respect to claims 24 and 38, Cohen further discloses *the path portion is identified by a data source identifier in the pattern* (Cohen, FIG. 5).

Regarding claims 28 and 42, Cohen teaches all of the claimed subject matter as discussed above with respect to claims 25 and 39, Cohen further discloses *the query string is identified by a data source identifier in the pattern* (Cohen, FIG. 5).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 3, 4 and 9-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Cohen et al. [USP 6,654,741 B1] in view of Ong [EP 1 160 692 A2].

Regarding claim 1, Cohen teaches a method for *redirecting a request, the request URL*

Including data related to a patterned URL, the method comprising:

receiving the request Uniform Resource Locator (URL) from a user system (Cohen, Col. 6 Lines 11-

12);

determining the patterned URL based on the data related to the patterned URL from the

request URL (Cohen, Col. 6 Lines 12-18, Input Expression as *patterned URL*);

determining whether a character from the patterned URL indicates a pattern that indicates a data source

type, wherein the data source type indicates a location of data for generating a destination URL (As shown in

Cohen, FIG. 3, the character [ ] as *a data source type*, the [ ] indicates a location of data for

generating a destination URL, e.g., b[aeiou]d matches bad, bed, bid, bod and bud but not bead

or beed);

when the character from the patterned URL indicates a pattern that indicates a data source type (After

determining the [ ] character as *data source type*), *interpreting a format specifier associated with the*

patterned URL (the + sign of FIG. 3 as *a format specifier* is determined), *wherein the format specifier*

indicates conditional formatting for the destination URL (The + sign of FIG. 3 of Cohen indicates

conditional formatting, e.g., ba+c matches bac, baac), and *generating a destination URL having data from the location indicated by the data source type, wherein the data is formatted based on the format specifier of the patterned URL* (Cohen, Col. 6 Lines 21-25, the output URL is generated based on the Output Expression based on the regular expression of Input Expression);

when the character from the patterned URL does not indicate a pattern that indicates a data source type, generating a destination URL having the copied character from the patterned URL (This step is not performed in the method when the patterned URL indicates a pattern).

The missing of Cohen is the step of *sending the destination URL to the user system for redirecting the user system*.

Ong discloses a method for redirecting a request URL (Ong, Abstract). Ong further discloses the step of *sending the destination URL to the user system for redirecting the user system* (Ong, Paragraph 0057).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to including the step of sending the destination URL in order to redirect the request to the site of the destination URL.

Regarding claim 3, Cohen and Ong, in combination, teach all of the claimed subject matter as discussed above with respect to claim 1, Cohen further discloses the step of *looking up an Hyper-Text Transfer Protocol (HTTP) address for the service and placing the address into the destination URL when the format specifier indicates the name of the service* (Cohen, Col. 6 Lines 10-43).

Regarding claim 4, Cohen and Ong, in combination, teach all of the claimed subject matter as discussed above with respect to claim 1, Cohen further discloses the step of *copying string data into the destination URL when the format specifier indicates the string data* (Cohen, Col. 6 Lines 10-43).

Regarding claim 9, Cohen and Ong, in combination, teach all of the claimed subject matter as discussed above with respect to claim 1, Cohen further discloses the step of *copying a following string to the destination URL when a previous portion of the patterned URL caused data to be written to the destination URL and when the format specifier indicates a special string copy* (Cohen, Col. 5 Lines 40-67).

Regarding claim 10, Cohen and Ong, in combination, teach all of the claimed subject matter as discussed above with respect to claim 1, Cohen further discloses the step of *copying a path part from the request URL to the destination URL, when the data source type indicates that data is located in a path portion of the request URL* (Cohen, Col. 5 Lines 40-67).

Regarding claim 11, Cohen and Ong, in combination, teach all of the claimed subject matter as discussed above with respect to claim 1, Cohen further discloses the step of *copying data from a query string of the request URL to the destination URL when the data source type indicates that data is located in the query string of the request URL* (Cohen, Col. 5 Lines 40-67).

Regarding claim 12, Cohen and Ong, in combination, teach all of the claimed subject matter as discussed above with respect to claim 1, Cohen further discloses the step of *copying a data source identifier from the patterned URL to the destination URL when the data source indicates that data is located in the data source identifier of the patterned URL* (Cohen, Col. 5 Lines 40-67).

Regarding claim 13, Cohen and Ong, in combination, teach all of the claimed subject matter as discussed above with respect to claim 10, Cohen further discloses *the path portion is identified by a data source identifier in the pattern* (Cohen, FIG. 5).

Regarding claim 14, Cohen and Ong, in combination, teach all of the claimed subject matter as discussed above with respect to claim 1, Cohen further discloses *the query string is identified by a data source identifier in the pattern* (Cohen, FIG. 5).

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 5-8, 19-22 and 33-36 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance:

Prior arts of record do not render obvious, nor anticipate the combination of claimed elements including *the format specifier indicates the language* or *culture* and the steps as in the claims.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to HUNG Q. PHAM whose telephone number is 571-272-4040. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, TIM T. VO can be reached on 571-272-3642. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private

PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you

would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the

automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

HUNG Q PHAM
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2168

July 5, 2007